

It From Bit vs Record From Physics: Wave–Particle–Bit, the Metrology of Evidence, and Why Standards Beat Slogans

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

January 10, 2026

John Archibald Wheeler’s “It from Bit” remains one of the most influential slogans in modern foundations: a provocative suggestion that physical “its” arise from informational “bits.” Yet slogans are not standards, and the quantum engineering era has made that difference impossible to ignore. Today, laboratories and deployed quantum systems succeed or fail not on metaphysical commitments, but on whether coherent dynamics can be preserved, events can be registered, and outcomes can be stabilized into traceable records that other teams can reproduce. This paper argues that the crucial pivot is not “it from bit,” but **record from physics**: the operational step by which wave dynamics and particle-like registration become durable, copyable, auditable evidence. Building on two January 2026 preprints—*Wave-Particle-Bit: Completing Quantum Duality with the Metrology of Records and the Geometry of Distinguishability* (DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.30925.09440) and *Wave, Particle, Bit: Completing the Thomson Legacy Through Operational Metrology of Evidence* (DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.22851.05922)—we clarify how a record-centric triad reframes duality, resists Planck-scale rhetoric, and yields practical templates for interoperability. The result is a disciplined bridge between foundations and infrastructure: a theory of evidence that treats the bit as first-class only where science actually lives—inside reproducible records.

Keywords: It from bit, Wheeler, wave particle bit, record from physics, metrology of records, quantum measurement, reproducible evidence, operational foundations, distinguishability geometry, traceability, uncertainty budgets, decoherence as record formation, quantum standards, interoperability, audit logs, calibration chains, state distance metrics, record discipline, quantum engineering, Thomson legacy.

A collaboration with GPT-5.2-Thinking. 45 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: Why “It From Bit” Needs an Engineering Counterpart

- 1.1 The power and ambiguity of Wheeler’s slogan
- 1.2 Quantum engineering changes the foundation problem
- 1.3 Thesis: not it-from-bit, but record-from-physics

2. Wheeler’s “It From Bit” in Its Strong and Weak Forms

- 2.1 Strong form: ontology from yes/no questions
- 2.2 Weak form: operational constraints of information processing
- 2.3 Where the slogan helps and where it blurs

3. The Wave–Particle–Bit Triad as a Completion of Evidence

- 3.1 Wave: coherent dynamics and interference
- 3.2 Particle: localized registration events
- 3.3 Bit: stabilized, copyable records as the evidence layer
- 3.4 The triad as an operational layer, not a new substance

4. “Information Is Physical” Reframed: Records Are Physical

- 4.1 Physical carriers, thresholds, and irreversibility
- 4.2 Why “potential information” is not yet evidence
- 4.3 The archive as the true interface to science

5. Duality Revisited: Interference Dies When the World Can Write a Bit

- 5.1 Which-path as recordability, not consciousness
- 5.2 Distinguishability vs disturbance: separating causes
- 5.3 Partial records and continuous tradeoffs
- 5.4 Environment as recorder: uncontrolled bit formation

6. Metrology: Turning Outcomes Into Comparable Public Facts

- 6.1 Traceability chains: frequency to phase to length to decision
- 6.2 Uncertainty budgets for record formation
- 6.3 Calibration as the boundary between experiment and evidence
- 6.4 Declared scales vs operational scales

7. Geometry of Distinguishability: From State Space to Device Space

- 7.1 Distances that mean something experimentally
- 7.2 Mapping state distance into meters as a reporting layer
- 7.3 What the mapping means and what it does not mean
- 7.4 Cross-platform comparability without ontological confusion

8. Standards Beat Slogans: Interoperability Through Record Discipline

- 8.1 Why single-number fidelities are not enough
- 8.2 Record pipelines: thresholds, gating, filtering, post-selection
- 8.3 Audit logs and reproducibility criteria
- 8.4 A triad-based comparability rubric

9. Avoiding Planck-Scale Rhetoric Without Losing Ambition

- 9.1 Why L_p is not a laboratory ruler
- 9.2 When “Planck-scale information” becomes a category error
- 9.3 The disciplined claim boundary: what can be recorded
- 9.4 How to talk about fundamentals without overclaiming

10. Practical Templates and Benchmarks

- 10.1 Verification checklist: coherence tests, event tests, record tests
- 10.2 Reporting template: what must be disclosed for comparability
- 10.3 Benchmarks: visibility, distinguishability, drift, bit error
- 10.4 Shared datasets: interlaboratory record comparators

11. Conclusion: From It-From-Bit to Record-From-Physics

- 11.1 Restating the distinction: ontology talk vs evidence discipline
- 11.2 What becomes clearer when “bit” is first-class as record
- 11.3 Future work: standards bodies, reference devices, record-centric protocols

12. References

- 12.1 Wheeler and “it from bit” lineage
- 12.2 Quantum measurement, complementarity, decoherence, quantum Darwinism
- 12.3 Metrology, SI traceability, uncertainty, interferometry
- 12.4 State discrimination and distance measures
- 12.5 Author preprints (January 2026 DOIs above)

Art

1. Introduction: Why “It From Bit” Needs an Engineering Counterpart

Wheeler’s “It from Bit” achieved something rare: it compressed a century of foundational unease into four words that could be repeated, argued over, and remembered. It also anticipated a cultural shift. As computation became the dominant metaphor for complex systems, and as physics became inseparable from information processing, “bit” began to feel like a plausible primitive. But the slogan’s success produced a predictable side effect: it became easy to treat “bit” as a philosophical solvent—something that dissolves hard questions about measurement, reality, and evidence into a single, suggestive phrase.

The quantum engineering era forces a more disciplined posture. Quantum devices now leave the seminar room and enter the lab-as-infrastructure: networks, sensors, clocks, processors, and distributed protocols. In that environment, the deepest questions are not “What is reality made of?” but “What counts as evidence?” and “How do independent groups obtain comparable results?” These are metrological questions before they are metaphysical ones. They involve traceability chains, uncertainty budgets, calibration discipline, and the brutal engineering fact that a “bit” is only meaningful when it is a stable, copyable record that can survive noise, drift, and scrutiny.

This paper proposes an engineering counterpart to Wheeler’s slogan. Not a rebuttal, and not a replacement—an operational completion. The core move is to relocate “bit” from ontology to evidence: not “it from bit,” but **record from physics**. The thesis is that quantum foundations become actionable when we explicitly model the final step that turns wave dynamics and particle-like registration into durable records. In that step, science becomes public.

1.1 The power and ambiguity of Wheeler’s slogan

“It from Bit” has power because it speaks to a real mystery: physics does not merely describe what happens; it describes what can be asked, what can be distinguished, and what can be known. The quantum measurement problem, in particular, makes the act of “getting an outcome” feel fundamentally participatory. Wheeler’s phrase captures this by centering yes/no questions—binary discriminations—as the bedrock of physical meaning. It invites the thought that reality may be, in some sense, an accumulation of answered questions.

The ambiguity is that “bit” can mean at least three different things, and the slogan often slides between them without warning. A “bit” can mean (1) an abstract logical distinction (yes/no), (2) a physical degree of freedom that can be in one of two stable states, or (3) a recorded outcome that has been stabilized, copied, and archived as evidence. Wheeler’s slogan draws its suggestive force from allowing these meanings to blur. The result is that readers can interpret it as metaphysics (“reality is information”), epistemology (“knowledge is built from distinctions”), or engineering (“computation has physical cost”), often without noticing the shift.

That interpretive flexibility is partly why the phrase has remained alive. It can be used as a program, a provocation, or a poetic compression. But it is also why it has not naturally generated standards. Slogans motivate; standards specify. When one tries to build laboratory comparability from “it from bit,” the missing piece becomes obvious: a bit is not just a distinction, but a **physical record** with a traceability history and a noise model. Without that specification, “bit” remains a powerful word and a weak instrument.

1.2 Quantum engineering changes the foundation problem

In the first century of quantum theory, foundational debates were often separable from experimental practice. Different interpretations could coexist because they largely agreed on predicted statistics for well-defined measurements. The lab succeeded by building apparatuses that produced reproducible outcomes; philosophers argued about what those outcomes meant.

Quantum engineering collapses that separation. The moment you try to scale quantum systems—connect them across distance, store states for long durations, compose gates in long circuits, deploy sensors in changing environments—the boundary between “quantum behavior” and “classical outcome” becomes something you must design deliberately. The foundations problem shifts from “What is the wavefunction?” to “Where does the record form, and how do we control that boundary?”

In other words, engineering turns the measurement problem into an interface problem. You must manage three distinct layers that are often conflated:

- Coherent dynamics: maintaining phase relations, suppressing dephasing, preserving indistinguishability.
- Registration events: detector clicks, readout thresholds, time tags, physical interactions that localize outcomes.
- Record formation: logging, archiving, calibration, drift compensation, audit trails, and reproducible reporting.

When these layers are not separated, common pathologies appear. Post-selection is mistaken for intrinsic coherence. Tight coincidence windows are mistaken for nonlocal miracles. Calibration drift is mistaken for “noise in the qubit.” Vendor claims become incomparable because “fidelity” silently includes different record pipelines. The engineering era makes these failures costly, because the goal is no longer a single compelling demonstration. The goal is interoperable infrastructure.

Thus, quantum engineering does not merely apply quantum theory; it stresses the theory at its boundary with evidence. It demands that “bit” be treated not as a metaphysical primitive, but

as an engineered product: a stable record produced by explicit procedures, with declared uncertainty, and with enough metadata to be reinterpreted by others.

1.3 Thesis: not it-from-bit, but record-from-physics

This paper's thesis is a disciplined re-centering: the foundational question that matters for science and technology is not "Does reality arise from bits?" but "How do physical processes produce records that can function as public evidence?" The phrase **record from physics** names the operational step that is typically glossed over in duality narratives and in "it from bit" talk. It is the step where a quantum interaction becomes a stored outcome—where the world's microdynamics are forced through a threshold into a durable, copyable symbol.

The proposed engineering counterpart is therefore not a rival ontology but a completion of the evidentiary chain. The wave–particle–bit framework keeps wave and particle exactly where physics has always found them: interference patterns and discrete events. It adds the third term because the third term is where science actually lives: in the archive of reproducible records. Records are physical. They require carriers, stability margins, redundancy, and irreversible dissipation of alternatives. They must be calibrated, timestamped, and made comparable across laboratories.

So the paper's opening move is to accept Wheeler's provocation but to narrow its operational meaning. A "bit" matters not because it magically generates "it," but because it is the final instrument by which "it" becomes evidence. If "it from bit" is a metaphysical horizon, "record from physics" is the metrological ground. The goal of this paper is to build that ground into a coherent framework, show how it clarifies duality without overclaiming, and propose practical templates that make record discipline a first-class standard in the quantum era.

2. Wheeler's "It From Bit" in Its Strong and Weak Forms

Before proposing an engineering counterpart, it helps to disambiguate what "It from Bit" can mean. Wheeler's phrase is not a single claim; it is a family of claims that range from metaphysical to methodological. Much of the confusion surrounding "It from Bit" comes from sliding between these meanings without stating which is intended. In a foundations context, that ambiguity can be productive. In a metrology context, it becomes corrosive: if "bit" is not specified as an operational artifact, then "it from bit" cannot generate reproducible protocols.

This section therefore separates two useful forms of Wheeler's idea. The strong form treats bits as ontological primitives, suggesting that physical reality is generated by yes/no questions or informational acts. The weak form treats information as physically constrained, emphasizing that computation and measurement must be realized in physical systems with energy, noise,

and irreversibility. The paper's approach aligns with the weak form while insisting that the strong form, when imported into experimental rhetoric, often blurs the distinction between declared metaphysics and operational evidence.

2.1 Strong form: ontology from yes/no questions

In the strong form, "It from Bit" is an ontological thesis: physical entities, laws, and perhaps even spacetime emerge from binary distinctions—ultimately, from answered questions. The "bit" here is not primarily a memory cell or a stored record. It is an abstract yes/no, elevated to the status of a generative principle. Reality becomes, in effect, the accumulation of resolved alternatives.

This strong form has an undeniable appeal in quantum mechanics because the theory already treats measurement outcomes as discrete and because the theory's core object, the quantum state, does not behave like a classical thing with definite properties independent of measurement context. If what exists is what can be distinguished, and if distinguishing is fundamentally a yes/no discrimination, then one can imagine "its" arising from "bits" in a deep sense. The world becomes "participatory": questions asked of nature are not merely epistemic probes but formative acts that help constitute the phenomena.

As a philosophical posture, the strong form can be generative. It invites questions like: what is a "question" in physics? what counts as a "fact"? why are outcomes discrete? what is the role of observer, apparatus, and environment? It also aligns with broader informational metaphors that have proven fruitful in physics and computer science.

But as soon as the strong form is treated as if it were a laboratory principle, it becomes slippery. "Yes/no questions" are not devices. They do not carry uncertainty budgets. They do not drift thermally. They do not require calibration. In the strong form, a bit is foundational; in engineering, a bit is manufactured—by thresholds, by amplification, by redundancy, and by irreversible stabilization. The strong form tends to treat bits as pristine logical atoms; the lab knows bits are noisy physical compromises.

So the strong form is best understood as metaphysics or meta-epistemology: it talks about what reality might be, not about how evidence is produced. That distinction is exactly where the present paper draws its line.

2.2 Weak form: operational constraints of information processing

In the weak form, "It from Bit" becomes a methodological constraint rather than an ontological thesis. It says: whatever physics is, it cannot ignore that information is processed in physical systems. Measurement, computation, communication, and storage all have costs. They are

constrained by noise, finite resources, and irreversibility. On this reading, “bit” is not a metaphysical generator; it is a physical artifact with engineering limits.

This weak form is the one that naturally interfaces with metrology. Here, “information is physical” means that any claim about information must be backed by a realizable procedure: a device that encodes distinctions, a protocol that preserves them, and an analysis that quantifies uncertainty. The bit is not an abstract yes/no; it is a difference that survives perturbation long enough to be read, copied, and compared.

Under the weak form, it becomes legitimate to talk about:

- noise margins and error rates in bit formation,
- thresholds and hysteresis as the mechanism of stable distinction,
- traceability chains that link decisions to physical references,
- and the thermodynamic and temporal costs of record stability.

This is precisely where the wave–particle–bit framework lives. It does not require that reality is built from bits. It requires only that science is built from records, and records are built from physically stabilized bits. The weak form therefore supports an engineering discipline: treat record formation as a physical process that can be measured, standardized, and audited.

Importantly, the weak form does not flatten quantum theory into computation. It allows quantum states to remain coherent objects in Hilbert space while insisting that any time we claim an “outcome,” we must specify how it became a record. In that sense, the weak form is compatible with many interpretations, because it is not an interpretation at all. It is an operational demand.

2.3 Where the slogan helps and where it blurs

“It from Bit” helps when it reminds us that:

- physics is not merely about objects but about what can be distinguished,
- measurement is not passive revelation but an intervention that produces outcomes,
- and informational constraints can be as fundamental as dynamical laws in practice.

The slogan also helps as a conceptual bridge: it makes it psychologically easier to take seriously the idea that the boundary between “system” and “apparatus” is not incidental. It invites the recognition that knowledge has a physical substrate. That is a healthy pressure against naive realism in which measurement is imagined as a transparent window.

But the slogan blurs crucial distinctions precisely where engineering needs them sharp.

It blurs **ontology and evidence** by suggesting that the existence of bits as a conceptual primitive automatically implies a standards program. It does not. You cannot build interoperability from a slogan. Interoperability requires record protocols.

It blurs **abstract distinctions and physical records** by treating “yes/no” as if it were already a “bit.” In laboratories, a bit is a stabilized state with a traceable origin. Without specifying thresholds, drift, calibration, and error rates, “bit” remains a metaphor.

It blurs **declared scales and operational scales** by tempting writers to attach ultimate units (Planck length, Planck time) to informational talk without a realizable measurement chain. In this paper’s language, those are declared scales until they are recordable.

Finally, it blurs **interpretation and protocol**. “It from Bit” can be read as an interpretation of quantum mechanics. The present program is not: it is a protocol-first approach that treats record formation as the completion of the measurement story.

So the paper’s stance can be stated cleanly: Wheeler’s slogan is valuable, but it needs an engineering counterpart. The counterpart is not another slogan, but a discipline: **record from physics**. That discipline keeps the motivating intuition of “it from bit” while demanding operational closure—traceability, uncertainty, and reproducible records—where science actually happens.

3. The Wave–Particle–Bit Triad as a Completion of Evidence

If “It from Bit” is a provocative compression of foundational unease, the wave–particle–bit triad is an attempt at operational completion. It does not ask what reality is “made of.” It asks what must happen—physically and procedurally—for a quantum phenomenon to become public evidence. The triad makes explicit what is often implicit in both textbook narratives and interpretive debates: quantum experiments do not end at wave evolution or even at detector clicks. They end when outcomes become durable records that can be copied, compared, audited, and reanalyzed.

The triad therefore reframes wave–particle duality as a partial story: waves describe coherent dynamics; particles describe localized events; bits describe evidence. Without the bit layer, duality remains a tale about behavior. With the bit layer, duality becomes a full account of how behavior becomes knowledge.

3.1 Wave: coherent dynamics and interference

The “wave” in the triad is not a classical wave in space. It is coherent quantum evolution: phase-bearing amplitudes that can superpose, interfere, and produce statistics that depend on relative

phase. In experiments, wave behavior is revealed by interference fringes, diffraction patterns, Ramsey oscillations, Rabi flopping, and any phenomenon in which the outcome probabilities depend on controlled phase relations.

Operationally, the wave layer is the domain of controlled possibility. It is where the system retains alternatives without committing to a classical history. The engineering questions at this layer are the familiar ones: how long coherence persists, which degrees of freedom leak phase information, how distinguishability creeps in through spectral or temporal mismatch, and how environmental coupling suppresses interference.

But it is crucial to emphasize what the wave layer does not provide. It does not provide an outcome. It provides a structured space of possible outcomes and the rules by which probabilities evolve. Even the most beautiful interference pattern is not “seen” at the wave layer; it is inferred from aggregated records created downstream. The wave layer is therefore necessary for quantum phenomena but insufficient for evidence.

In the triad, “wave” names the causal substrate of quantum signatures—the phase-sensitive engine that later stages can either preserve, exploit, or destroy.

3.2 Particle: localized registration events

The “particle” in the triad names the fact that experiments produce discrete registration events. A photon is absorbed; a detector clicks; a superconducting readout transitions; an ion fluoresces; a charge packet is collected. These are localized interactions that yield individual outcomes, even when the underlying dynamics were delocalized and coherent.

Operationally, the particle layer is the domain of event generation. It is where the continuous evolution of amplitudes becomes punctuated by happenings. Importantly, these happenings are not yet “bits” in the strict sense. An interaction can occur without yielding a durable record. A microscopic scattering event can happen and then be washed away by noise, thermalization, or insufficient amplification. The triad separates “event” from “record” to prevent a common confusion: the assumption that a detector event automatically equals evidence.

The particle layer also helps clarify why wave–particle talk is not a contradiction but a sequencing problem. A system can exhibit wave behavior in its coherent evolution and produce particle-like events when interrogated. The core question then becomes: under what conditions do those events acquire the permanence of a record? That question is not answered by wave–particle duality alone. It requires the third term.

In the triad, “particle” names the localized punctuations of reality that arise when coherent possibilities are forced through an interaction channel.

3.3 Bit: stabilized, copyable records as the evidence layer

The “bit” is the paper’s key move: it names the evidence layer. A bit is not merely a yes/no distinction in the abstract. It is a stabilized, copyable record produced by a physical process that enforces discreteness through thresholds, amplification, redundancy, and persistence.

This is the layer at which science becomes public. A record can be stored, transported, independently verified, compared across laboratories, reprocessed with different analysis choices, and audited for bias or drift. A record can support traceability chains and uncertainty budgets. A record can be cited, challenged, and reproduced.

Operationally, bit formation is where irreversibility enters. To create a durable bit, a system must dump entropy into degrees of freedom that are not tracked—heat, phonons, electromagnetic dissipation, or the spread of information across many microscopic states. This irreversibility is not a philosophical embellishment; it is the mechanism by which a measurement outcome becomes stable. Without it, the “outcome” is a transient fluctuation. With it, the outcome becomes an element of an archive.

This is also where many interpretive confusions dissolve into engineering questions. “Collapse” becomes record formation. “Observer” becomes a record pipeline. “Which-path information” becomes recordability: whether the alternatives can be encoded in a stable degree of freedom accessible to the environment or apparatus. In practice, the most decisive experimental question is often not “Is the system quantum?” but “Where did the record form, and under what protocol?”

In the triad, “bit” names the physical production of evidence: the step that turns events into facts.

3.4 The triad as an operational layer, not a new substance

Because the word “bit” invites metaphysical inflation, the triad must be explicitly constrained. It is not a claim that there are three kinds of stuff in the universe—waves, particles, and bits. It is a claim that experiments and technologies can be productively decomposed into three operational layers:

- a coherence layer (wave) that governs phase-sensitive dynamics,
- an event layer (particle) that governs localized registrations,
- and a record layer (bit) that governs durable evidence.

This is why the triad is best treated as a completion of the story of evidence, not as a new ontology. It does not compete with quantum field theory, nor does it replace the formalism of

measurement theory. It is a discipline for keeping track of what is happening in a system, what is happening in a detector, and what is happening in the archive.

Seen this way, the triad provides a practical vocabulary that links foundations to engineering without requiring interpretive commitments. One can be Copenhagen, Everettian, Bohmian, or operationalist and still agree on the triad as a description of how laboratories produce claims. The triad does not adjudicate “what is real” in the deepest sense. It adjudicates what is **recorded**, and therefore what can be tested, compared, and built upon.

That is its intended completion: wave and particle describe behavior; bit describes evidence. When the bit is included explicitly, duality stops being a paradox to repeat and becomes a pipeline to design.

4. “Information Is Physical” Reframed: Records Are Physical

The phrase “information is physical” is often invoked as if it settles something foundational. But as a working principle it is too broad: it treats potential distinctions, fleeting correlations, and durable evidence as though they belong to the same category. The wave–particle–bit triad forces a sharper claim. If we want an assertion that is both true and operationally useful, it is this: **records are physical**. A record is not an idea; it is a stabilized state of matter or field configuration that has been engineered (or allowed by the environment) to persist, to be copied, and to be interrogated by independent parties.

This reframing matters because quantum foundations and quantum engineering converge on the same bottleneck: where and how outcomes become publicly checkable. Interference and entanglement can exist without leaving stable traces. A “measurement outcome” that cannot be preserved, transported, or reanalyzed is not yet science in the public sense; it is at best a private event. Treating records as the physical core of evidence replaces metaphysical talk with metrological discipline: carriers, thresholds, irreversibility, and the architecture of the archive.

4.1 Physical carriers, thresholds, and irreversibility

A record requires a carrier. In practice, that carrier might be charge stored on a capacitor, a magnetic domain orientation, a trapped ion’s internal state subsequently amplified into fluorescence counts, a superconducting resonator readout digitized into a binary decision, a photodiode pulse integrated and thresholded, or a pattern of pits in a storage medium. The carrier is the substrate on which the bit is realized.

But a carrier alone is not enough. What makes a record a record is the presence of **stability mechanisms**—engineering features that produce two (or more) robust basins of attraction. Thresholds, hysteresis, redundancy, and error margins are the physical instruments that turn

analog variability into discrete persistence. A record is not merely a value; it is a value with a moat around it.

This is why thresholds are central. The moment an outcome is pushed through a threshold—voltage comparator, photon count cutoff, discriminator, latching circuit—it becomes resilient to small perturbations. Thresholding is the physical act of decision. It converts a continuum of microscopic possibilities into a discrete macrostate that can be repeatedly read without being erased. In many systems, thresholding is accompanied by amplification, because microscopic signals must be expanded to macroscopic scales where they can be stored and copied.

All of this implies irreversibility. To make a record stable, the system must dispose of information about alternative microstates. That disposal typically occurs through dissipation: heat, phonons, electromagnetic radiation, or entropic spreading into degrees of freedom not tracked by the observer. Irreversibility is not merely a thermodynamic footnote; it is the mechanism of durability. A record is durable precisely because it has “paid” an entropy cost to become so.

This is also where the bit becomes distinguishable from the particle event. A localized interaction can occur without producing a stable macrostate. Conversely, a stable macrostate can be produced only by forcing microscopic outcomes into a regime where they can survive environmental noise and device drift. The record is therefore a deliberately constructed boundary object: it sits at the junction between microphysics and public evidence.

4.2 Why “potential information” is not yet evidence

Quantum theory is saturated with potential information. A superposition contains structured alternatives. An entangled state contains correlations. A coherent field contains phase relations that can be converted into probabilities. But potential information is not evidence until it becomes recordable under a declared protocol.

This distinction is easy to miss because quantum language encourages it. We speak of a state “encoding” information, of entanglement “carrying” information, of coherence “containing” phase. Yet none of these claims guarantee that a fact exists in the scientific sense. A coherent state may be exquisitely informative and still produce no stable record if the measurement chain is noisy, uncalibrated, or inconsistent. An entangled pair may carry correlations and still yield untrustworthy evidence if the detection gates are poorly defined or the timestamps drift.

In the triad vocabulary: wave-layer structure and particle-layer events can support evidence, but they do not constitute evidence. Evidence begins when outcomes are stabilized into the bit layer. Until then, what we have is **a hypothesis about what could be extracted**, not a public fact that has actually been extracted.

This is why the paper resists the temptation to treat “bit” as a metaphysical primitive. The relevant distinction is not between “information exists” and “information does not exist,” but between:

- information as **latent distinguishability** in a state-space, and
- information as **committed record** in an archive.

The first can be discussed in the language of Hilbert space geometry and distinguishability measures. The second must be discussed in the language of metrology: traceability, uncertainty, calibration, drift, and reproducibility. Only the second supports the social contract of science, where independent groups can test claims without requiring access to the claimant’s inner conviction or private apparatus conditions.

Thus, “potential information” is real in the mathematical sense and often real in the engineering sense, but it is not yet evidence. Evidence is what survives contact with time, noise, and skepticism.

4.3 The archive as the true interface to science

If records are physical, then the archive is not an administrative afterthought. It is the interface through which science exists as a communal enterprise. The archive includes not only stored outcomes but the metadata that gives outcomes meaning: timestamps, device configurations, calibration states, environmental monitors, software versions, decision thresholds, and declared post-processing rules.

This has a subtle but decisive consequence: the boundary between “experiment” and “result” does not sit at the detector. It sits at the archive. The detector produces events; the archive produces facts. The archive is where comparability is won or lost. Two groups may run physically similar experiments and report irreconcilable results because their record pipelines differ: one applies tight coincidence filters; another reports raw streams. One corrects drift; another averages it away. One logs calibration state continuously; another recalibrates by memory. These differences are not philosophical; they are archival.

Treating the archive as the true interface also clarifies what reproducibility means in the quantum era. Reproducibility is not simply repeating an experimental arrangement. It is reproducing a record protocol: the full chain by which outcomes become durable, interpretable, and comparable. This includes the disclosure of what was discarded, what was thresholded, what was corrected, what was assumed, and what uncertainties dominate.

The triad therefore leads to a pragmatic redefinition of foundational seriousness. To be “foundational” is not merely to speculate about ontology. It is to specify the conditions under

which claims become stable public artifacts. On that definition, the archive is the foundational object, because it is where the world's behavior becomes a shareable geometry of evidence.

In summary: “information is physical” becomes actionable only when it is narrowed to “records are physical.” Records require carriers, thresholds, and irreversibility. Potential information is not yet evidence. And the archive—structured, timestamped, metadata-rich—is the true interface through which science is made, checked, and inherited.

5. Duality Revisited: Interference Dies When the World Can Write a Bit

Wave–particle duality is often presented as a mysterious alternation: sometimes nature behaves like a wave, sometimes like a particle, and the presence of an observer seems to decide which. The wave–particle–bit framework forces a different reading. Interference does not “die” because a mind observes. It dies because the physical world has acquired the capacity to **store** which-alternative information in a stable way—because a bit can be written, intentionally or not. Once a record exists in principle, the coherent alternatives cease to behave as a single phase-sensitive entity. The visibility of interference becomes a measure of how hard it is for the world to write that bit.

This section reinterprets the standard complementarity narrative as a record-centric pipeline: coherence persists when alternatives remain indistinguishable; interference fades when distinguishability becomes recordable; and decoherence is the uncontrolled spread of which-alternative correlations into environmental degrees of freedom that function as a recorder. The payoff is not a new metaphysics but a sharper operational story: if you want interference, you must prevent the world from writing the bit. If you want classical outcomes, you must allow the bit to stabilize.

5.1 Which-path as recordability, not consciousness

“Which-path information” is often described as if it were knowledge in someone's head. But in the lab, which-path information is a physical condition: whether there exists any degree of freedom—inside the apparatus or in the surrounding environment—that becomes correlated with the alternative histories in a way that could, even in principle, be read out as a stable distinction.

Under this view, the double-slit experiment is not fundamentally about whether someone watches the particle. It is about whether the two alternatives (left slit, right slit) remain **indistinguishable** at the level of physically accessible records. If the apparatus tags the alternatives—by polarization rotation, timing shift, spectral mark, recoil, scattered photons—

then the alternatives become distinguishable, and interference visibility decreases. The crucial point is that the tag need not be read by a human. It only needs to be *recordable*.

Thus, “which-path information exists” means: there is an available record channel. A bit can be written. Once that channel exists with sufficient stability and separation, the coherent alternatives no longer add as phases in the same way. The wave behavior fades not because a conscious act occurs, but because the world’s dynamics have created the conditions for a durable correlation—an incipient record.

This is why the triad demotes consciousness without denying experience. Conscious observers may interpret records, but the physical condition that kills interference is recordability, not awareness.

5.2 Distinguishability vs disturbance: separating causes

A persistent confusion in complementarity is whether interference disappears because the particle is “disturbed” by measurement, or because the alternatives become “known.” The record-centric framing separates these into two different mechanisms that often co-occur but need not be identical.

Disturbance is a dynamical effect: an interaction changes the system’s state, perhaps randomizing phase or adding noise. Disturbance can destroy interference by scrambling coherence directly.

Distinguishability is an informational effect: an interaction correlates the system with another degree of freedom so that the alternatives become separable. Distinguishability can destroy interference even when the system is not violently disturbed, because coherence is not merely fragile—it is relational. Coherence requires that alternatives remain indistinguishable in all record-relevant degrees of freedom.

The triad model clarifies that the essential interference-killing move is the growth of **recordable distinguishability**. Disturbance is one common way to produce distinguishability, but it is not the logical essence. One can imagine gentle couplings that minimally disturb energy or momentum while still producing a reliable tag—precisely the kind of couplings modern experiments exploit. Conversely, one can disturb a system without creating a stable record channel, in which case the outcome may look like noise rather than complementarity.

Separating these causes matters because engineering decisions depend on it. If interference loss is disturbance-dominated, you improve isolation and control. If interference loss is distinguishability-dominated, you remove tagging channels, improve mode overlap, and prevent record leakage. The triad gives you the correct diagnostic question: did coherence fail because phase was scrambled, or because the world learned too much in a recordable way?

5.3 Partial records and continuous tradeoffs

Complementarity is often taught as a binary: either you get interference or you get which-path information. Real experiments show a continuum. Interference visibility can decline smoothly as which-path information becomes partially available. This is exactly what the record-centric view predicts, because record formation itself is not always all-or-nothing. A “bit” can be half-written: correlations can exist without being fully amplified, stable, or separated from noise.

Partial recordability produces partial distinguishability. A weak tag, a noisy marker, or a leaky channel does not yield a clean bit, but it yields enough correlation to reduce interference. In this regime, the system and its marker degrees of freedom are neither fully coherent nor fully classical. The lab sees this as reduced visibility, broadened fringes, diminished contrast, and increased statistical uncertainty about phase.

The triad’s conceptual advantage here is to reframe the tradeoff as a tradeoff between two kinds of geometry:

- the geometry of coherent addition (wave layer), where alternatives overlap strongly and phase matters,
- and the geometry of separability (bit layer), where alternatives become distinct enough to support stable records.

As the system slides along this continuum, what changes is not an observer’s knowledge, but the physical separation between alternative histories in the space of recordable degrees of freedom. Interference is strong when those histories remain close; interference fades when they drift apart.

This perspective also clarifies why “erasure” can restore interference. If the record channel is made indistinguishable again—if the marker information is scrambled or recombined so that alternatives overlap—the bit is effectively unwritten, and coherence can reappear in the statistics. What matters is not what was known, but what remains recordable at the end of the pipeline.

5.4 Environment as recorder: uncontrolled bit formation

The most important recorder in real systems is not the experimental apparatus but the environment. Every uncontrolled coupling is a potential writing instrument. Scattered photons carry away information about position, momentum, and path. Thermal vibrations carry away phase information. Electrical noise couples system states to many degrees of freedom. In each case, the environment acquires correlations that can function as a record channel, even if no one ever reads them.

In the triad language, decoherence is the environment writing bits without permission. It is uncontrolled record formation. Coherence dies because the system's alternatives become imprinted into the environment in a distributed, redundant way. Once that imprint becomes sufficiently stable and widespread, the system behaves as if it has selected a classical history—because the alternative histories are now separated by an enormous distance in environmental state space. They cannot recombine coherently in any practical sense.

This is why “isolation” is not merely about reducing noise. It is about preventing unauthorized recording. It is about keeping the world from learning which alternative occurred. Quantum engineering, at bottom, is the art of controlling when and where record formation happens. A quantum computer must prevent environmental recording until the final readout. A quantum sensor may deliberately allow controlled recording to extract a signal while suppressing uncontrolled channels. A quantum network must coordinate record formation across distance with synchronized protocols. In all cases, the enemy of coherence is not the observer—it is the world's ability to write.

So duality becomes less mystical and more architectural. Interference dies when recordability rises. Classical reality emerges when the environment becomes an efficient recorder. And the “measurement problem” becomes, in practice, a problem of record discipline: defining, controlling, and standardizing the moment the bit is formed.

6. Metrology: Turning Outcomes Into Comparable Public Facts

Quantum foundations can be discussed indefinitely, but quantum engineering and interlaboratory science demand closure. Closure does not come from interpretation; it comes from metrology. Metrology is the discipline that turns a private occurrence into a public fact by specifying how it was realized, how it was compared to standards, and how uncertainty was quantified. Under the wave–particle–bit triad, metrology is not a peripheral concern. It is the mechanism by which “bit” becomes real in the only sense that matters for science: stable, comparable, and traceable.

The key move in this section is to treat record formation as a measurable, standardizable process. A “bit” is not simply an output; it is the endpoint of a chain: physical reference → controlled encoding → detection event → decision threshold → logged record. If any link is unspecified, the outcome is not fully public. It may be reproducible in one lab but not comparable across labs. This is exactly the modern failure mode: impressive demonstrations that cannot be meaningfully benchmarked because the record pipeline is not standardized.

To fix this, we must write down traceability chains, uncertainty budgets, and calibration protocols that explicitly link record formation to physical references. Only then can outcomes move from “what happened here” to “what anyone can verify.”

6.1 Traceability chains: frequency to phase to length to decision

One of the cleanest routes from a physical standard to a recordable bit is the chain that runs through optical frequency and interferometry. The logic is straightforward: frequency standards are among the most precise references humanity can realize; phase is directly related to frequency integrated over time; and phase differences map to path-length differences through well-defined relations. From there, threshold decisions convert analog phase-sensitive signals into bits.

A canonical chain looks like this:

- **Frequency reference:** a stabilized oscillator or optical transition provides a known frequency. This is the metrological anchor because frequency can be measured and disseminated with extraordinary precision.
- **Phase control and measurement:** the system encodes information as phase differences in coherent fields. Interference visibility and fringe phase become the measurable handles.
- **Length mapping:** phase differences can be converted into effective path-length differences (in interferometric architectures) through known relationships between wavelength and distance.
- **Decision threshold:** the analog observable (fringe intensity, quadrature signal, photon counts) is pushed through a decision rule (threshold, discriminator, maximum-likelihood assignment) to produce a bit.
- **Record logging:** the bit is stored with timestamps, configuration metadata, calibration state, and error flags.

This chain matters because it makes “bit formation” legible in physical units. It shows that the bit is not an abstract yes/no but a physically anchored decision derived from calibrated observables. In the triad framing, this is the completion step: wave-level phase becomes particle-level events (detections), then becomes bit-level records (decisions and logs).

Crucially, the chain also tells you where comparability can fail. If two labs use different thresholds, different gating windows, different phase referencing, or different filtering pipelines, they are not forming the same “bit,” even if they claim to be measuring the same phenomenon. Traceability forces the question: traceable to what, exactly, and through which transformations?

6.2 Uncertainty budgets for record formation

If a bit is the endpoint of a physical chain, then bit formation has an uncertainty budget. This is a strong claim, and it is where “records are physical” becomes metrology rather than philosophy. The key is to recognize that uncertainty enters not only in the measured observable, but in the decision rule and in the stability of the record channel itself.

A record-formation uncertainty budget typically includes:

- **Reference uncertainty:** stability and accuracy of the underlying frequency or timing reference.
- **Transfer uncertainty:** noise and drift in converting the reference into the encoded variable (phase, delay, path length).
- **Environmental uncertainty:** thermal drift, mechanical vibration, polarization fluctuations, electromagnetic interference, and other couplings that change the mapping from state to observable.
- **Detection uncertainty:** shot noise, dark counts, jitter, finite detection efficiency, saturation, afterpulsing, and other detector nonidealities.
- **Decision uncertainty:** threshold selection, classifier bias, postselection criteria, and the statistical confidence required to commit a bit.
- **Archival uncertainty:** timing errors, metadata loss, software version changes, quantization artifacts, compression, and logging failures.

This list is not pedantry. It is the difference between a demonstration and a standard. A lab can “get a result” while silently absorbing these uncertainties in a way that cannot be compared elsewhere. A standard requires that uncertainties be declared, allocated, and tracked over time.

The triad framework adds a particularly important point: some uncertainties manifest as coherence loss (wave layer), some as event ambiguity (particle layer), and some as record instability (bit layer). Without a triad decomposition, these uncertainties get mixed together under one metric (often “fidelity”), which makes debugging and cross-lab comparison nearly impossible.

A record-centric uncertainty budget therefore functions as both an engineering tool and an epistemic discipline. It forces explicit disclosure of the mechanisms by which bits were created and preserved.

6.3 Calibration as the boundary between experiment and evidence

Calibration is the boundary where experimental behavior becomes public evidence. Before calibration, you have an apparatus that behaves. After calibration, you have a device that makes claims in units other people can understand and verify.

Under the triad, calibration is not merely about aligning a measurement scale. It is about defining the transition from particle events to bit records. Calibration answers questions like:

- What counts as a “click” versus noise?
- What coincidence window defines an event as paired?
- What phase reference defines a relative phase as zero?
- What threshold defines a 0 versus a 1?
- What metadata must accompany each record so the decision can be reproduced?

This is why calibration is foundational. It establishes the conventions that transform raw physical occurrences into standardized records. Without calibration, the apparatus may produce impressive phenomena, but those phenomena remain partially private because the mapping from occurrence to record is underdefined.

In a mature quantum technology stack, calibration is continuous rather than episodic. Drift is unavoidable, and so calibration must be tracked as a time-dependent object: the “meaning” of a bit depends on the calibration state at the moment it was written. That is exactly why audit logs matter. The archive must not only store outcomes; it must store the calibration context that makes the outcomes interpretable.

Thus, calibration is the practical answer to a deep philosophical question: what makes a measurement outcome a fact? The answer is not “an observer saw it.” The answer is “a calibrated pipeline committed it into a traceable record.”

6.4 Declared scales vs operational scales

Quantum writing is full of declared scales: Planck length, Planck time, ultimate limits, fundamental discreteness. The triad approach imposes a discipline: declared scales are not operational scales until they are connected to recordable procedures.

An operational scale is one you can realize in the lab with a traceability chain and an uncertainty budget. It is a scale at which you can form bits in a controlled way, compare them across devices, and reconcile disagreements with reference to shared standards. Declared scales, by contrast, are often aspirational or metaphysical. They may be meaningful in theory, but they are not yet part of the evidence pipeline.

The point is not to forbid speculation. The point is to prevent category errors. If someone claims “information at the Planck scale” but cannot specify how a record could be formed, stored, and compared, then the claim is not metrological. It is rhetorical. Similarly, if someone defines a “bit distance” as Planck length but does not show how to realize that distance as a calibrated discriminator in a physical device, the definition functions as metaphor, not as standard.

The triad’s operational stance is therefore simple: do not confuse the scale of your words with the scale of your records. Reality may indeed have deep structure at scales we cannot access. But science, as a public enterprise, lives at the scales where records can be formed, stabilized, and shared.

This distinction becomes especially important in the quantum era because the line between “theory” and “technology” is thin. Quantum claims increasingly arrive packaged as engineering claims. Metrology is the filter that separates declared scale from operational scale, and record discipline is the mechanism by which that separation is maintained.

In summary, metrology is how quantum outcomes become comparable public facts: through traceability chains that anchor bit formation to physical references, through uncertainty budgets that quantify record formation, through calibration that marks the boundary between behavior and evidence, and through a disciplined separation of declared scales from operational scales. The result is not merely better measurement; it is better science—science that can be shared without metaphysical coercion because it is grounded in reproducible records.

7. Geometry of Distinguishability: From State Space to Device Space

If the wave–particle–bit triad is about completing the evidentiary pipeline, the geometry of distinguishability is about giving that pipeline a quantitative backbone. Quantum theory already supplies a rich geometry: inner products, angles, overlaps, and distances on the space of states. Engineering supplies another geometry: device parameters, tolerances, drifts, and calibrations. The central challenge is to connect these two geometries without confusing them.

This section develops a disciplined bridge: treat state-space geometry as the natural language of distinguishability, then treat device-space parameters as the implementable controls that determine which state distances are realized and how reliably records can be written. The guiding idea is not to force Hilbert space into Euclidean space, but to create a reporting layer that allows experiments to be compared by translating a subset of state-space distances into physically anchored quantities, such as phase error expressed as an equivalent path-length mismatch.

The payoff is practical: when two systems disagree, we want to know whether they differ in the wave layer (state preparation and coherence), the particle layer (event generation), or the bit layer (record formation). A geometry of distinguishability gives a common scale for that diagnosis.

7.1 Distances that mean something experimentally

Not all distances in quantum theory are equally useful in the lab. Some are mathematically elegant but operationally opaque. Others line up directly with measurable quantities such as interference visibility, error probability, or discrimination confidence.

The experimentally meaningful notion underlying all of them is this: **distance measures how well two alternatives can be told apart by an allowed measurement and an allowed record pipeline**. That is why inner products matter. The overlap between states is not merely a number; it determines whether the system can carry which-alternative information without destroying coherence, and it determines how many trials are required to distinguish hypotheses with a given error rate.

In practice, the lab sees “distance” as:

- **visibility** in interferometry: how strongly interference fringes appear as a function of phase,
- **error rate** in discrimination: how often a classifier misidentifies the prepared state,
- **stability** under drift: how quickly these metrics degrade over time,
- **separation in control space**: how far apart device settings must be to produce distinguishable outcomes.

Thus, the paper’s stance is operational: choose distance measures because they predict experimentally accessible performance. A distance is “real” in the engineering sense when it can be tied to a measurable consequence, such as probability of confusion, number of required samples, or calibration tolerance.

This also clarifies why “distinguishability” belongs at the center of the triad program. The wave layer governs overlap and interference; the particle layer governs event statistics; the bit layer governs what is actually recorded and thus what can be used to decide between alternatives. Distances are the quantitative link between these layers.

7.2 Mapping state distance into meters as a reporting layer

Because laboratories are built in physical space, it is tempting—and sometimes useful—to express portions of state-space geometry in spatial units. The most straightforward case is

interferometric phase. In many platforms, phase is controlled by path length, delay, or optical frequency. That allows a clean translation:

- A phase offset corresponds to an effective path-length mismatch relative to a reference wavelength.
- A state-space angle between two phase-encoded states corresponds to a physical displacement in a well-defined interferometric component.

In the present paper’s language, this mapping is not an ontological claim that quantum states are “separated in space.” It is a reporting layer: a standardized way to express how much physical tuning is required to produce a given state-space separation in a particular architecture.

For phase-encoded or path-encoded systems, an equivalent-meter mapping can be defined by taking a reference wavelength (or effective wavelength in the relevant medium) and relating a phase difference to a length difference via a chosen scale factor. This yields a physically legible quantity: the “meter-equivalent distance” that would produce the same phase difference in an interferometer.

The virtue of such a mapping is not philosophical. It is practical:

- It allows engineers to quote tolerances in familiar units.
- It enables cross-team discussions about drift and stability without forcing everyone into abstract state metrics.
- It anchors record comparability to SI-traceable chains where available.

In other words, it helps a quantum lab speak the language of metrology while still respecting the geometry of state distinguishability.

7.3 What the mapping means and what it does not mean

This is the critical discipline point. Mapping state distance into meters can easily become rhetorical overreach. The paper insists on explicit boundaries.

What the mapping means:

- It means that, in a particular implementation, a state parameter (typically phase or delay) is controlled by a physical length or timing element.
- It means that small deviations in that physical element correspond to predictable deviations in state overlap, visibility, and error rates.
- It means that reporting “equivalent meters” can help standardize calibration, drift measurement, and reproducibility.

What the mapping does not mean:

- It does not mean that the two components of a superposition are spatially separated by that number of meters in any literal sense.
- It does not mean that the Hilbert space metric is identical to Euclidean distance.
- It does not mean that “quantum information lives in space” in a new ontological way.
- It does not mean that such a mapping is platform-independent without careful specification of encoding, wavelength, medium, and measurement protocol.

So the mapping is explicitly a convenience: a translation layer from a state parameter to a physical knob. It is comparable to quoting an electronic phase noise in time jitter units. The conversion is meaningful because it is tied to a defined reference and a defined measurement chain—not because it reveals the “true distance” between states in the universe.

This boundary is especially important because it prevents the Planck-scale temptation. One can always declare a mapping that makes a state difference correspond to arbitrarily small spatial units. But unless that mapping is realizable with traceable uncertainty, it is declarative metaphysics, not metrology. The paper’s rule is simple: if you cannot connect the mapping to a record protocol with a declared uncertainty budget, treat it as a metaphor.

7.4 Cross-platform comparability without ontological confusion

The central engineering problem in quantum technology is comparability across platforms: photons, ions, superconductors, spins, neutral atoms, and hybrid systems. Each platform has its own device-space geometry—different control knobs, different noise sources, different drift modes. Yet they all inhabit a shared state-space geometry, at least at the level of qubits, channels, and distinguishability measures.

The way to compare platforms is not to force them into a single physical picture of “distance,” but to compare them through a layered rubric:

- At the state-space level: report distinguishability metrics that have clear operational meaning (error rates, visibilities, overlaps under specified measurements).
- At the device-space level: report the physical tolerances and drift parameters that control those metrics (phase stability, timing jitter, thermal coefficients, calibration cadence).
- At the record level: report the decision rules and archival protocols that turn observables into bits (thresholds, gating, postselection, metadata disclosure).

This layered comparability avoids ontological confusion. It does not require agreement about whether the wavefunction is real, or whether collapse is fundamental, or whether information is ontologically primary. It requires only agreement about the evidence pipeline: what was prepared, what was measured, what was recorded, and how uncertainties were assigned.

In this sense, the geometry of distinguishability is the mathematical skeleton of the record discipline program. It allows a platform-neutral language of “how well alternatives can be told apart,” while the mapping into device parameters provides platform-specific levers for achieving that distinguishability. The archive then completes the loop by making those claims public.

Thus, the section’s conclusion is pragmatic: quantum technologies become interoperable not by adopting a shared metaphysics, but by adopting shared reporting layers that faithfully connect state-space geometry to device-space controls and to record protocols. The result is comparability without coercion—scientific agreement anchored in reproducible records rather than interpretive allegiance.

8. Standards Beat Slogans: Interoperability Through Record Discipline

Slogans motivate research programs; standards make technologies interoperable. “It from Bit” can inspire a generation, but it cannot tell two laboratories how to compare results when their detectors, timing systems, thresholds, and filtering logic differ. The moment quantum systems move from demonstrations to infrastructure, the field inherits an old truth from engineering: you do not get interoperability by agreeing on metaphors. You get it by agreeing on protocols, disclosures, and acceptance tests.

The wave–particle–bit triad makes this truth explicit. The wave layer can be elegant and coherent; the particle layer can produce clean events; and yet the bit layer can silently sabotage comparability if record formation is handled differently across devices, labs, or vendors. The single most common failure mode in modern quantum claims is not theoretical error; it is **record ambiguity**: unreported thresholds, undocumented gating windows, hidden post-selection rules, drifting calibrations, and incomplete metadata. This section argues that record discipline must be treated as a first-class engineering object and proposes practical structures for doing so.

8.1 Why single-number fidelities are not enough

Quantum performance is often summarized by a small set of single numbers: fidelity, purity, coherence time, gate error, quantum volume, or a headline “success probability.” These numbers are useful, but they are not sufficient for interoperability because they compress away the very details that determine how a system will behave when integrated with another system.

Single-number reporting fails in four predictable ways:

- **Context collapse:** A fidelity number depends on which measurement basis was used, which error model was assumed, how drift was handled, and what was excluded. Two fidelities with the same numeric value can reflect fundamentally different systems.
- **Pipeline opacity:** Fidelity can silently incorporate threshold choices, coincidence gating, background subtraction, and postselection. These are record-layer operations. If they are not disclosed, fidelity becomes vendor-specific semantics rather than a physical property.
- **Nonstationarity blindness:** Many quantum systems drift. A single number hides whether the system is stable over hours, days, or temperature cycles. Interoperability is more sensitive to stability than to peak performance.
- **Loss of failure modes:** Engineering depends on knowing how things fail. Single numbers rarely expose whether errors are dominated by coherence loss (wave), misregistration (particle), or record mishandling (bit).

The triad demands a different posture: report performance in a way that preserves layer separation. Fidelity is not banned; it is contextualized. Interoperability requires that we know not only “how good” but “good under what pipeline, with what record protocol, and with what drift behavior.”

8.2 Record pipelines: thresholds, gating, filtering, post-selection

Record formation is never a pure readout of nature. It is a pipeline of decisions. Some decisions are hardware (comparators, discriminators, latches). Others are software (filters, coincidence logic, classifier thresholds, rejection rules). Together they form the bit layer: the process by which events become archived outcomes.

The most common pipeline elements are:

- **Thresholds:** The rule that separates 0 from 1 (or more generally assigns a symbol). Thresholds can be fixed, adaptive, learned, or drift-corrected. Each choice changes the meaning of the resulting bits.
- **Gating windows:** Time windows that define which events “count” and which are ignored (coincidence windows in photon experiments, readout integration times in superconducting systems, detection intervals in ion fluorescence). Gating determines the statistical structure of the bitstream.

- **Filtering:** Noise suppression, baseline subtraction, dark count correction, smoothing, or bandpass filtering. Filtering can improve apparent performance while altering what is truly recorded. Filtering is not illegitimate, but it must be declared.
- **Post-selection:** Selection of a subset of events according to criteria applied after measurement (discarding runs where a herald failed, removing events with low confidence, excluding data during instability). Post-selection is sometimes necessary, but it is the most common source of comparability failure because it silently changes denominators.

The triad’s diagnostic claim is simple: many disagreements labeled “foundational” are actually pipeline disagreements. Two teams can run nominally similar experiments and obtain different “quantum” conclusions because their record pipelines implement different decision geometries. The cure is not interpretive debate; it is standardized disclosure of record pipelines and shared acceptance tests.

8.3 Audit logs and reproducibility criteria

If record pipelines define the bit layer, audit logs define whether those bits can function as public evidence. An audit log is not bureaucracy. It is the mechanism by which a record can be traced back to the physical conditions of its formation.

A triad-compliant audit posture treats the following as non-optional for reproducibility:

- **Configuration capture:** device settings, control waveforms, measurement bases, thresholds, gating definitions, and postselection rules, all versioned.
- **Calibration context:** timestamps of calibrations, drift-correction parameters, reference states used, and calibration validity windows.
- **Environmental monitors:** temperature, vibration proxies, magnetic field monitors, laser power, timing reference health, and any variable known to couple to performance.
- **Software provenance:** firmware versions, control software commit identifiers, classifier training versions, and any changes during runs.
- **Raw and derived data:** preservation of raw event streams when feasible, plus derived bitstreams, with clear mapping from raw to derived.

Reproducibility criteria then become concrete. Instead of vague claims that “the experiment is reproducible,” triad-based reproducibility is defined as the ability for an independent group to reconstruct the same bitstream statistics from the disclosed pipeline under comparable conditions, and to attribute any deviations to declared uncertainty budgets or drift parameters.

This transforms reproducibility from a moral aspiration into an engineering specification: what must be logged, what must be versioned, what must be disclosed, and what acceptance tests must pass.

8.4 A triad-based comparability rubric

To make these ideas actionable, the triad suggests a comparability rubric that avoids both metaphysical coercion and shallow single-number marketing. The rubric has three layers and a set of required disclosures per layer.

Wave-layer (coherence) comparability:

- coherence times under declared protocols
- interference visibility under controlled phase sweeps
- mode overlap measures relevant to the platform
- dominant decoherence channels and their measured coefficients
- stability of these metrics over time and operating conditions

Particle-layer (events) comparability:

- detection efficiencies, dead times, jitters, and background rates
- event definitions: what constitutes a detection, a coincidence, a successful readout
- event timing models and synchronization assumptions
- rates, saturation behaviors, and nonlinearity regimes
- error modes specific to event generation (afterpulsing, crosstalk, leakage)

Bit-layer (records) comparability:

- threshold rules and classifier definitions
- gating windows and filtering operations
- postselection criteria and fractions discarded
- raw-to-bit transformation pipeline, explicitly documented
- archival guarantees: timestamps, metadata schema, audit log completeness, data retention

The rubric’s purpose is not to burden experiments; it is to make claims portable. It tells a third party what they need in order to compare, integrate, or dispute results without guessing what happened between detection and publication.

In this framework, standards beat slogans because standards preserve meaning across contexts. Wheeler’s slogan remains philosophically valuable, but quantum infrastructure requires something else: a record discipline that makes outcomes comparable public facts. The wave–particle–bit triad provides the conceptual scaffold, and the comparability rubric provides the procedural spine. Together, they shift the field from interpretive persuasion to operational interoperability—where disagreement can be localized, quantified, and resolved as engineering rather than mythology.

9. Avoiding Planck-Scale Rhetoric Without Losing Ambition

Invoking the Planck scale has become a kind of intellectual incense: it signals depth, ultimate limits, and contact with fundamental reality. In quantum information discourse, it is increasingly common to see phrases like “Planck-scale information,” “bits at the Planck length,” or “quantum gravity as computation.” Some of this is serious theoretical work. Much of it is motivational rhetoric. The danger is not that the Planck scale is irrelevant, but that it becomes a proxy for rigor when it is not accompanied by an operational chain that could, even in principle, write a record.

The wave–particle–bit program is explicitly ambitious. It seeks to make evidence pipelines as disciplined as the best of optical metrology and timing standards. But it insists on a boundary: ambitious talk about fundamentals must not be smuggled into claims of measurement or evidence without a traceability story. If “records are physical,” then what we can responsibly claim is limited by what can be stabilized, copied, compared, and audited. The Planck length is a meaningful theoretical constant; it is not automatically a laboratory unit. Treating it as if it were can collapse the distinction between declared and operational scales and can reintroduce metaphysical overreach through the back door.

This section proposes a posture: keep ambition, but enforce claim discipline. One can speak about the Planck scale as a horizon for theory. One must not speak as if one has metrological access to it without specifying how records could be formed at that scale.

9.1 Why L_p is not a laboratory ruler

A ruler is not defined by its label; it is defined by its realizability. In metrology, a “unit” becomes real when it can be instantiated by reproducible procedures with declared uncertainties and traceability chains. The Planck length, L_p , is defined by fundamental constants and is therefore

deeply meaningful in theory. But theoretical definition does not imply experimental accessibility.

There are three reasons L_p is not a laboratory ruler in ordinary contexts.

First, L_p is far below the resolution of essentially all direct spatial measurement techniques. Laboratory length measurement is ultimately mediated by waves (optical, microwave) and by material stability. Even the best interferometric measurements, which can detect extraordinarily small displacements, operate by measuring phase changes of fields with finite wavelength and finite noise. A “ruler” at L_p would require either wavelengths of comparable scale or an alternative mechanism that couples linearly and controllably to L_p -scale geometry, and does so in a way that produces stable, replicable records.

Second, the physical systems that would need to serve as carriers for Planck-scale distinctions do not behave like rigid rulers. At the scale of devices and materials, thermal motion, quantum fluctuations, mechanical noise, and environmental couplings dominate. The metrological fact is brutal: you do not get Planck-scale stability by declaring it. Stability is engineered and paid for with isolation, averaging, redundancy, and dissipation. L_p is a constant; it is not a manufactured stability margin.

Third, if one takes seriously the idea that the Planck scale is where quantum gravity effects become non-negligible, then using it as a laboratory unit quietly assumes a theory of quantum gravity. Metrology cannot rest on unknown physics without acknowledging that it has stepped outside confirmed operational territory. At that point, L_p becomes not a ruler but a hypothesis marker: it labels where new physics might appear, not where your apparatus is currently calibrated.

So L_p can function as a conceptual landmark and a dimensional scale-setter for theory. It cannot function as a general-purpose instrument of record formation in the laboratory sense.

9.2 When “Planck-scale information” becomes a category error

The phrase “Planck-scale information” often commits a category error by conflating three distinct things:

- a theoretical scale at which certain dimensional combinations of constants produce a length,
- an operational encoding of information into physical carriers,
- and a record protocol that stabilizes that encoding into durable evidence.

One can meaningfully speak about information in theoretical models at Planck-scale energies or curvatures, if the model is explicit. But to speak as if “information exists at L_p ” in the record sense is to pretend that a bit is present where no record pipeline is specified.

Under the triad framework, information becomes scientifically relevant when it becomes recordable. A “bit” is not an abstract yes/no in a vacuum; it is an engineered state that can be copied and audited. Without a proposed physical carrier, without a threshold mechanism, and without an irreversibility channel that stabilizes the distinction, talk of “Planck-scale bits” is not metrology. It is metaphor.

The category error becomes clearest when one asks a simple question: what would count as a record? If the answer is “we can’t measure it, but it’s fundamental,” then the claim is ontological or theoretical, not evidentiary. That may be legitimate in speculative physics, but it is not the same kind of claim as “our device produced these outcomes with this uncertainty.”

The paper’s position is not anti-fundamental. It is anti-confusion. A theoretical statement about the Planck scale must not be framed as if it were an operational statement about records unless the record chain is specified.

9.3 The disciplined claim boundary: what can be recorded

The wave–particle–bit framework proposes a clean boundary for responsible scientific claims: you can claim what you can record in a traceable way, and you can speculate beyond that only if you label it explicitly as speculation.

This boundary is not conservative in spirit; it is conservative in grammar. It preserves ambition while protecting the reader from accidental coercion. It requires that every empirical-sounding statement be backed by a record pipeline:

- What was the physical carrier of the bit?
- What was the threshold or decision rule?
- What was the calibration reference?
- What was the uncertainty budget?
- What was the archival protocol and metadata?
- What would falsify the claim in an independent replication?

If these cannot be answered, then the statement should not be phrased as an experimental conclusion. It can be phrased as a theoretical proposal, a conjecture, or a conceptual possibility.

This discipline also prevents the inflation of scales. One can declare “a bit distance of L_p ” in a mathematical mapping, but if one cannot realize that mapping as a stable discrimination in a physical device, then the declaration does not produce evidence. It produces a symbol. Symbols can be valuable, but the triad framework is explicitly about closing the gap between symbol and record.

So the claim boundary is: evidence lives where records live. The moment you step beyond recordability, you must shift linguistic mode: from reporting to proposing.

9.4 How to talk about fundamentals without overclaiming

Avoiding Planck-scale rhetoric does not mean avoiding fundamental questions. It means adopting a disciplined way to speak about them that respects the difference between theory and evidence.

A productive posture is to treat the Planck scale as a “limit label” with three legitimate roles:

- **Scale-setting in theory:** L_p marks where certain dimensionless ratios become order one, and where known effective theories may break down.
- **Constraint target:** experiments can place bounds on Planck-suppressed effects even if they do not access L_p directly, by searching for tiny deviations that would accumulate over large distances, long times, or high sensitivities.
- **Design horizon:** one can use L_p as a conceptual horizon that motivates better metrology—better clocks, better interferometers, better record discipline—without claiming direct access.

This yields a language of ambition that stays honest:

- Instead of “we measured Planck-scale information,” say “we tested for effects predicted to be suppressed by Planck-scale parameters, within these sensitivity limits.”
- Instead of “the qubit superposition states are separated by L_p ,” say “we define a formal mapping from state-space angle to an equivalent length scale; it is a reporting convention with declared uncertainty and does not imply literal spatial separation.”
- Instead of “gravity is information at L_p ,” say “some approaches suggest a deep relation between geometry and information; our contribution is to specify how record formation remains the operational bottleneck for any such claim.”

In other words, fundamentals can be discussed rigorously by tying them to falsifiable constraints, careful mappings, and explicit disclaimers about what is operational versus declared.

The broader philosophical point aligns with the triad’s ethos: the deepest virtue of science is not that it speaks about ultimate reality, but that it speaks in a way that other people can check. Planck-scale talk becomes valuable when it motivates better checking—better instruments, better logs, better standards—not when it substitutes for them.

So the section’s conclusion is a stance of mature ambition: keep the Planck scale as a theoretical horizon, but insist that evidence remains record-bound. The wave–particle–bit framework does not shrink the imagination; it strengthens it by refusing to let metaphor impersonate measurement.

10. Practical Templates and Benchmarks

If the preceding sections argue that record discipline is the missing engineering counterpart to “It from Bit,” then this section makes the argument actionable. Quantum technologies do not become interoperable because their theories agree; they become interoperable because their **tests, logs, and disclosures** agree. The wave–particle–bit triad provides a clean decomposition of what must be validated: coherence (wave), events (particle), and records (bit). Practical templates make those validations repeatable. Benchmarks make them comparable. Shared datasets make them social.

The main objective here is to replace vague claims (“high fidelity,” “state of the art,” “quantum advantage”) with a minimal set of artifacts that allow independent comparison: verification checklists, reporting templates, benchmark definitions, and dataset conventions that preserve raw-to-record provenance. The guiding principle is simple: if another lab cannot reconstruct your bitstream logic and its uncertainty context, you have not yet produced a public fact.

10.1 Verification checklist: coherence tests, event tests, record tests

A triad-based verification checklist is not a single list. It is three lists—one per layer—plus explicit boundary checks that ensure the layers are not being conflated. The goal is to identify whether a failure originates in the wave layer (coherence), the particle layer (event generation), or the bit layer (record formation and logging).

Wave-layer (coherence) tests:

- Coherence characterization under the same control sequences used in the main experiment (not a separate “best case” demo)
- Phase stability measurements over the relevant timescales (single run, hour, day)
- Interference visibility scans as a function of controlled phase changes

- Mode overlap verification (spectral, temporal, polarization, spatial) when applicable
- Sensitivity of coherence metrics to environmental variables (temperature, vibration proxies, field drift)

Particle-layer (event) tests:

- Detector efficiency and linearity across the operating range
- Timing jitter, dead time, saturation, and recovery characteristics
- Background rates and their dependence on environment and settings
- Event definition tests: confirm that the declared “event” corresponds to a physical registration with predictable statistics
- Coincidence logic tests (if used): validate time-tag alignment and window definitions against known references

Bit-layer (record) tests:

- Threshold stability: confirm that the 0/1 decision rule remains invariant (or is tracked) under drift
- Pipeline integrity tests: confirm that filtering, gating, and postselection are functioning as declared
- Logging completeness: confirm that every run produces the required metadata, timestamps, and configuration snapshots
- Provenance checks: confirm that derived bitstreams can be regenerated from stored raw data using versioned code
- Audit checks: confirm that anomalies are detected and flagged rather than silently absorbed

Boundary checks (where errors hide):

- Confirm that “coherence improvement” is not merely increased postselection or tighter gating
- Confirm that “high fidelity” is not dependent on discarding unstable intervals without disclosure
- Confirm that event definitions do not shift with software updates or operator choices without version tracking

A triad checklist is successful when it allows a team to localize failure modes quickly. If a system “looks quantum” in one metric but fails in deployment, the checklist forces the question: did wave coherence fail, did event registration fail, or did record discipline fail?

10.2 Reporting template: what must be disclosed for comparability

Interoperability requires a reporting template that makes two experiments comparable even when their platforms differ. The template must carry enough structure that a reader can reconstruct the evidence pipeline, not merely admire the results. A triad-based template should be organized into three disclosure blocks, plus a provenance block.

Wave-layer disclosures:

- State preparation description and control sequences
- Measured coherence metrics under operational conditions (not idealized)
- Interference visibility and phase stability summaries
- Dominant decoherence channels and measured sensitivities

Particle-layer disclosures:

- Detector models and key parameters (efficiency, jitter, dead time, backgrounds)
- Event definition: what constitutes a “click” or “successful readout”
- Timing architecture: clock references, synchronization method, time-tag resolution
- Rate regime: operating count rates and any saturation protections

Bit-layer disclosures:

- Threshold rules and classification method (fixed threshold, adaptive threshold, classifier model)
- Gating windows: definitions, durations, alignment method
- Filtering operations: baseline subtraction, smoothing, bandpass, denoising, and their parameter values
- Postselection rules: criteria, fraction rejected, and rationale

Provenance and audit disclosures:

- Calibration schedule and drift corrections used
- Firmware/software versions and any changes during data collection

- Raw data availability statement and mapping from raw events to final bitstreams
- Uncertainty budget summary: which terms dominate and how they were estimated

The template is not about maximal disclosure; it is about minimal sufficiency. It should be possible for a third party to reproduce the core analysis and to understand what parts are sensitive to pipeline choices. Without these disclosures, “results” become stories rather than standards.

10.3 Benchmarks: visibility, distinguishability, drift, bit error

Benchmarks are only useful if they are layered and time-aware. A quantum system that performs brilliantly for ten minutes but drifts unpredictably is not equivalent to a system that performs slightly worse but remains stable over days. The triad therefore recommends benchmarks in four categories, each tied to a layer or boundary.

Visibility benchmarks (wave-layer dominant):

- Interference visibility measured under declared conditions, over declared timescales
- Visibility degradation as a function of induced perturbations (temperature step, phase modulation, timing offset)
- Visibility stability over time (trend, variance, and worst-case excursions)

Distinguishability benchmarks (state-space meets device-space):

- Error probability for discriminating declared pairs (or sets) of states under declared measurement protocols
- Sample complexity: number of trials needed to achieve a target confidence
- Sensitivity of distinguishability to miscalibration (phase offset, timing skew, polarization mismatch)

Drift benchmarks (the silent killer):

- Drift rate of key calibration parameters (phase zero, threshold level, timing alignment)
- Mean time between recalibrations required to maintain performance
- Performance under thermal cycling or environmental variation
- Hysteresis behavior: does the system return to the same calibration after perturbation?

Bit error benchmarks (bit-layer dominant):

- Bit error rate under declared pipeline rules, including how “error” is defined

- Error decomposition: what fraction arises from detection noise, threshold bias, timing mismatch, or filtering artifacts
- Robustness of bit error under changes in postselection fraction (a crucial anti-overfitting test)
- Consistency checks: do independent replays of the pipeline yield identical bitstreams?

A field-level problem today is that “benchmarks” are often reported without stating which layer dominates their behavior. The triad solves this by making layer attribution a first-class reporting element. If the benchmark improves, you must be able to say whether that improvement came from better coherence, better detection, or better record formation. Otherwise, you risk mistaking pipeline tightening for physics.

10.4 Shared datasets: interlaboratory record comparators

If standards beat slogans, shared datasets beat isolated demonstrations. But “shared dataset” cannot mean a final figure or a curated table. It must mean a record comparator: a dataset structured so that different labs can run the same analysis, compare the same uncertainties, and diagnose differences at the layer boundaries.

A triad-compliant shared dataset should include:

- Raw event streams when feasible (time tags, detector channels, analog samples if relevant)
- Derived bitstreams produced by a declared pipeline
- Full metadata: configuration snapshots, thresholds, gating rules, calibration context, environmental monitors
- Versioned analysis code or pseudocode sufficient to regenerate derived outputs from raw inputs
- A set of “challenge tasks” that act as comparators: reproduce visibility curves, reproduce discrimination error rates, reproduce drift estimates, reproduce bit error decompositions

Interlaboratory comparators then become possible. Two labs can run the same challenge task and report differences. Those differences can be localized:

- If visibility differs but record pipelines match, the wave layer likely differs.
- If event statistics differ, the particle layer likely differs.
- If derived bits differ while raw events match, the bit layer pipeline differs.

This is how quantum technology becomes infrastructural. It becomes a domain where disagreements are not settled by rhetoric but by structured comparison of records. The triad makes datasets legible by insisting that the dataset preserve the wave-to-particle-to-bit lineage.

The practical endgame is a standards ecosystem: reference devices, reference datasets, and reference pipelines that allow a lab to say, credibly, “our system is comparable to yours,” without requiring shared metaphysics. That is how the quantum field matures: not by winning the interpretation debate, but by making evidence portable.

11. Conclusion: From It-From-Bit to Record-From-Physics

Wheeler’s “It from Bit” remains a powerful intellectual landmark. It compresses a genuine tension in quantum theory: the world does not present itself as a set of fully possessed properties, but as a set of distinctions that become definite through measurement. Yet the modern quantum era has changed what we need from foundational language. We now build devices whose success depends on disciplined evidence pipelines: coherence that can be maintained, events that can be registered, and outcomes that can be stabilized into durable, auditable records. In that setting, the most important “bit” is not the metaphysical yes/no, but the engineered record that makes a claim public.

This paper’s central move is therefore not a rejection of Wheeler, but an operational completion: shift from “it-from-bit” as an ontological invitation to **record-from-physics** as an evidence discipline. The wave–particle–bit triad reorders the narrative of quantum phenomena into a pipeline: coherent dynamics (wave), localized registrations (particle), and stabilized records (bit). That pipeline is where experimental claims are actually made, compared, falsified, and inherited. It is also where the field’s current comparability failures arise: in hidden thresholds, undocumented gating, quiet postselection, drifting calibration, and incomplete metadata.

If science is the public geometry of reproducible records, then quantum science becomes mature precisely when it treats record formation as first-class.

11.1 Restating the distinction: ontology talk vs evidence discipline

The paper’s distinction can be stated simply. “It from Bit” is primarily a statement about what might be fundamental. “Record from Physics” is a statement about what can be made public and checkable.

Ontology talk asks: what is real, what is primary, what generates what. Evidence discipline asks: what was recorded, how was it calibrated, what uncertainty was assigned, and how could an

independent group reproduce or falsify it. Ontology talk can be inspiring, and it can be intellectually serious, but it is not a substitute for metrology.

The wave–particle–bit triad is intentionally positioned as an operational layer. It does not require agreement on whether wavefunctions are real objects, whether collapse is fundamental, or whether information is ontologically prior. It requires agreement on something far more tractable: the structure of the evidence pipeline. It says: identify where coherence lives, where events occur, and where records stabilize. Then report each layer with enough disclosure that another lab can interpret the evidence without guessing.

This is why the paper treats Planck-scale rhetoric as a special case of category error. Declared scales are not operational scales unless they are connected to recordable procedures. The discipline is linguistic and procedural: do not phrase unrecordable speculation as if it were measured fact.

11.2 What becomes clearer when “bit” is first-class as record

When “bit” is treated as first-class in the record sense—stabilized, copyable, auditable—three clarifications follow immediately.

First, the measurement problem becomes an interface problem. The mysterious “collapse” is recast as the physical process of record formation: thresholds, amplification, dissipation, redundancy, and archival commitment. This does not solve the metaphysical puzzle, but it makes the operational boundary explicit and therefore engineerable.

Second, complementarity becomes legible as recordability. Interference dies not because a mind observes, but because the world acquires the capacity to store which-alternative information in accessible degrees of freedom. Which-path information is not consciousness; it is record channel availability. The environment is the primary recorder, and decoherence is uncontrolled bit formation.

Third, interoperability becomes a standards problem rather than a persuasion problem. Many disputes that appear foundational are revealed as pipeline disputes: different thresholds, different gating windows, different filtering logic, different postselection criteria, different calibration drift treatments. Treating the bit layer explicitly forces disclosure of these choices and prevents single-number summaries from hiding them. It also enables diagnostics: when results differ, the triad helps localize whether the disagreement originates in coherence, event registration, or record formation.

This is the practical payoff of the triad. It produces clarity, and clarity produces comparability.

11.3 Future work: standards bodies, reference devices, record-centric protocols

The natural future of this program is not another interpretive school. It is a standards ecosystem that makes quantum evidence portable. Three development paths follow directly from the paper's thesis.

Standards bodies and working groups:

A record-centric framework needs institutional homes. Existing metrology organizations and quantum standards initiatives can host working groups devoted specifically to record formation protocols: minimum metadata schemas, calibration disclosure requirements, and benchmark definitions that preserve layer separation. The goal is not to impose a metaphysics, but to impose a minimal disclosure grammar that makes claims comparable.

Reference devices:

Every mature measurement field has reference artifacts and reference implementations. Quantum technology needs analogous tools: simple, well-characterized devices whose purpose is not to demonstrate novelty but to stabilize comparability. Reference interferometers for phase-to-bit conversion, reference detection modules with audited thresholds and timing, and reference pipelines that can be replayed deterministically would serve as anchors for interlaboratory benchmarking.

Record-centric protocols and datasets:

The most immediate step is practical. Publish not only results but record comparators: datasets with raw event streams (when feasible), derived bitstreams, full metadata, and versioned pipeline definitions. Define challenge tasks that force comparability—reproduce visibility curves, reproduce discrimination error rates, reproduce drift models, reproduce bit error decompositions. This is how the field learns to disagree productively: by comparing record geometries rather than trading narratives.

In the long run, the “record from physics” program can evolve into what might be called a living record theory: a systematic account of how records propagate, degrade, fork through postprocessing, and acquire trust through audit structures. But the immediate objective is simpler: treat the bit layer as a physical, metrological object, and build standards accordingly.

The final claim of this paper is therefore disciplined and sufficient. Wheeler's “It from Bit” remains a luminous provocation about foundations. The engineering era demands a complementary discipline: **science advances when records become reproducible and comparable**. The wave–particle–bit triad completes duality not by adding metaphysics, but by adding the missing step that makes evidence real: the physical formation of the record.

12. References

12.1 Wheeler and “it from bit” lineage

- Wheeler, J. A. (1990). Information, Physics, Quantum: The Search for Links. In W. H. Zurek (Ed.), *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*. Addison-Wesley.
- Wheeler, J. A. (1989). Information, Physics, Quantum: The Search for Links. In *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Foundations of Quantum Mechanics in the Light of New Technology* (Tokyo).
- Wheeler, J. A., & Zurek, W. H. (Eds.). (1983). *Quantum Theory and Measurement*. Princeton University Press.
- Wheeler, J. A. (1994). *At Home in the Universe*. American Institute of Physics Press.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27, 379–423, 623–656.
- Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and Heat Generation in the Computing Process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5(3), 183–191. doi:10.1147/rd.53.0183
- Bennett, C. H. (1973). Logical Reversibility of Computation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 17(6), 525–532. doi:10.1147/rd.176.0525
- Lloyd, S. (2000). Ultimate Physical Limits to Computation. *Nature*, 406, 1047–1054. doi:10.1038/35023282

12.2 Quantum measurement, complementarity, decoherence, quantum Darwinism

- Bohr, N. (1928). The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory. *Nature*, 121, 580–590.
- von Neumann, J. (1932; English trans. 1955). *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton University Press.
- Wootters, W. K., & Zurek, W. H. (1979). Complementarity in the Double-Slit Experiment: Quantum Nonseparability and a Quantitative Statement of Bohr’s Principle. *Physical Review D*, 19, 473. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.19.473
- Greenberger, D. M., & Yasin, A. (1988). Simultaneous Wave and Particle Knowledge in a Neutron Interferometer. *Physics Letters A*, 128, 391–394.
- Englert, B.-G. (1996). Fringe Visibility and Which-Way Information: An Inequality. *Physical Review Letters*, 77, 2154–2157. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.2154
- Scully, M. O., & Druehl, K. (1982). Quantum Eraser: A Proposed Photon Correlation Experiment Concerning Observation and “Delayed Choice” in Quantum Mechanics. *Physical Review A*, 25, 2208–2213. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.25.2208
- Joos, E., & Zeh, H. D. (1985). The Emergence of Classical Properties Through Interaction with the Environment. *Zeitschrift fuer Physik B*, 59, 223–243. doi:10.1007/BF01725541
- Schlosshauer, M. (2007). *Decoherence and the Quantum-to-Classical Transition*. Springer.
- Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, Einselection, and the Quantum Origins of the Classical.

Reviews of Modern Physics, 75, 715–775. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.75.715

Ollivier, H., Poulin, D., & Zurek, W. H. (2004). Objective Properties from Subjective Quantum States: Environment as a Witness. *Physical Review Letters*, 93, 220401.

doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.220401

Ollivier, H., Poulin, D., & Zurek, W. H. (2005). Environment as a Witness: Selective Proliferation of Information and Emergence of Objectivity in a Quantum Universe. *Physical Review A*, 72, 042113. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.72.042113

Zurek, W. H. (2009). Quantum Darwinism. *Nature Physics*, 5, 181–188. doi:10.1038/nphys1202

12.3 Metrology, SI traceability, uncertainty, interferometry

Bureau International des Poids et Mesures (BIPM). (2019; revised 2025). *The International System of Units (SI Brochure)*, 9th edition. doi:10.59161/AUEZ1291

CIPM (as maintained by BIPM). *Mise en pratique for the definition of the metre* (current version; associated with the SI Brochure and CIPM recommendations).

JCGM. (2008). *Evaluation of measurement data: Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement (GUM)*. JCGM 100:2008.

JCGM. (2008). *Evaluation of measurement data: Supplement 1 to the GUM: Propagation of distributions using a Monte Carlo method*. JCGM 101:2008.

JCGM. (2012). *International vocabulary of metrology (VIM): Basic and general concepts and associated terms*. JCGM 200:2012.

NIST. *Guidelines for Evaluating and Expressing the Uncertainty of NIST Measurement Results* (NIST Technical Note 1297; current revision).

Udem, Th., Holzwarth, R., & Haensch, T. W. (2002). Optical Frequency Metrology. *Nature*, 416, 233–237. doi:10.1038/416233a

Allan, D. W. (1966). Statistics of Atomic Frequency Standards. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 54(2), 221–230.

Hariharan, P. (2003). *Optical Interferometry* (2nd ed.). Academic Press.

12.4 State discrimination and distance measures

Helstrom, C. W. (1976). *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*. Academic Press.

Holevo, A. S. (1982). *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*. North-Holland.

Fuchs, C. A., & van de Graaf, J. (1999). Cryptographic Distinguishability Measures for Quantum-Mechanical States. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(4), 1216–1227.

doi:10.1109/18.771243

Audenaert, K. M. R., et al. (2007). Discriminating States: The Quantum Chernoff Bound. *Physical Review Letters*, 98, 160501. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.160501

Barnett, S. M., & Croke, S. (2009). Quantum State Discrimination. *Advances in Optics and Photonics*, 1(2), 238–278. doi:10.1364/AOP.1.000238

Nielsen, M. A., & Chuang, I. L. (2010). *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (10th

Anniversary ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Watrous, J. (2018). *The Theory of Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press.

Wilde, M. M. (2017). *Quantum Information Theory* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

12.5 Author preprints (January 2026 DOIs above)

Youvan, D. C. (2026). *Wave-Particle-Bit: Completing Quantum Duality with the Metrology of Records and the Geometry of Distinguishability*. January 2026.

doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.30925.09440

Youvan, D. C. (2026). *Wave, Particle, Bit: Completing the Thomson Legacy Through Operational Metrology of Evidence*. January 2026. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.22851.05922

Youvan, D. C. (2026). *Metrology for Bits and Qubits in Meters: Operational Standards, State-Space Geometry, and Traceable Calibration Chains*. January 2026.

doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.32445.52966

The author has published over 4,800 AI-assisted papers at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research> . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

